

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

MAXIMILLIAN LEDWITH,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSH WIEDERHOLT,

Defendants.

---

OPINION AND ORDER

17-cv-397-wmc

Plaintiff Maximillian Ledwith filed this case in the Circuit Court for Dane County, Wisconsin. On May 24, 2017, the United States, on behalf of defendant, Josh Wiederholt, DDS of Access Community Health Center's Dental Clinic, removed the action to this court. A telephone pretrial conference was scheduled for August 9, 2017, but plaintiff failed to participate. In a text order entered that same day, plaintiff was told that he had until August 31, 2017, to advise this court whether he wanted to pursue this case. That order has been returned to the court undeliverable, reflecting that plaintiff is not at the address he provided on his complaint. Plaintiff has failed to provide the court with an updated address or otherwise establish contact with this court since the case was removed here from the Dane County Circuit Court.

It is not the obligation of either this court or the clerk's office to search for litigants. Rather, it is the litigant's responsibility to advise the court of any change to his or her contact information. *See Casimir v. Sunrise Fin., Inc.*, 299 F. App'x 591, 593, 2008 WL 4922422 (7th Cir. 2008) (affirming the denial of a Rule 60(b) motion where movants

claimed they did not receive notice of summary judgment due to a house fire, adding that “all litigants, including pro se litigants, are responsible for maintaining communication with the court”); *see also Soliman v. Johanns*, 412 F.3d 920, 922 (8th Cir. 2005) (“[A] litigant who invokes the processes of the federal courts is responsible for maintaining communication with the court during the pendency of his lawsuit.”). Plaintiff has clearly failed to provide the court with an accurate, current address. Because plaintiff has failed to provide a current address, it appears that he has abandoned this lawsuit.

Accordingly, under the inherent power necessarily vested in a court to manage its own docket, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962); *Ohio River Co. v. Carrillo*, 754 F.2d 236, 238 n.5 (7th Cir. 1984).

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the complaint filed by plaintiff Maximillian Ledwith is DISMISSED without prejudice for want of prosecution. Plaintiff is advised that relief from this order may be granted upon a showing of good cause.

Entered this 26th day of September, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

WILLIAM M. CONLEY  
District Judge